

REMARKS

In the November 22, 2005 Office Action, claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the November 22, 2005 Office Action, the applicants have amended claim 1. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the following comments.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Baxter et al. (US 5,407,854). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

On Page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that:

"Baxter et al. teach in figure 4 a thin portion 405 having one upper surface which coincide with the lower surface of layer 401. The at least one through hole extends to said one upper surface of the thin portion. Therefore, Baxter et al. teach at least one through hole extends from the recessed portion, and entirely through the thin portion to the upper surface of the thin portion, as claimed."

The applicants respectfully disagree with the overly broad interpretation being given to the terms "thin portion" and "through hole". Claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification. MPEP 2111. A reasonable interpretation of claim 1 that is consistent with the specification would clearly not encompass the structure disclosed in Figure 4 of the Baxter et al. reference.

As clearly described in the specification, and as previously pointed out by the applicants during the prosecution of this application, one or more through holes are formed in the thin portion so as to allow wiring to extend entirely through the semiconductor substrate, e.g., from the upper surface of the semiconductor substrate, through the recessed portion, and over to the lower surface of the semiconductor substrate. In addition, one or more through holes are formed in the thin portion so as to allow fluids to flow through the semiconductor substrate, e.g., from the upper surface of the semiconductor substrate, through the recessed portion, and over to the lower surface of the semiconductor substrate.

This cannot be achieved with the structure disclosed in Figure 4 of the Baxter et al. reference, because there are no through holes in the semiconductor substrate that extend entirely through the semiconductor substrate. Therefore, wiring cannot extend from the upper surface of the semiconductor substrate, through the recessed portion, and over to the lower surface of the semiconductor substrate. In addition, fluids cannot flow from the upper

surface of the semiconductor substrate, through the recessed portion, and over to the lower surface of the semiconductor substrate.

Nonetheless, in order to expedite the allowance of the present claims, the applicants have amended claim 1 so as to recite that "at least one through hole is formed in the thin portion that extends from the recessed portion, and entirely through the thin portion to the upper surface of the semiconductor substrate".

Thus, because claim 1 is clearly not anticipated by the Baxter et al. reference, the applicants respectfully submit that both independent claim 1 and any claim that depends therefrom are now in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 102/103

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Baxter et al. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, on the ground that claim 4 is allowable in its current form because it is dependent upon claim 1, which as noted above, the applicants respectfully submit is now allowable over the cited prior art.

In view of the foregoing amendments and comments, the applicants respectfully assert that the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this communication (including extension of time fees) or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2042.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven Roberts/

Steven Roberts
Reg. No. 39,346

Shinju Global IP
c/o GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
Phone No. (202) 293-0444
Dated: February 22, 2006